UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,700	01/10/2007	Matti Kalervo	915-001.081	4521

4955 7590 03/17/2008

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
RUIZ, ANGELICA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/572,700	KALERVO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANGELICA RUIZ	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01/10/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 March 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *March/20/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 20, 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The specification is objected because of improper numbering. Numbering on pages 1-15, left numbers from 5 to 35 should be removed, to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.52. Proper correction is required.

37 CFR 1.52. Language, paper, writing, margins, compact disc specifications.

(6) Other than in a reissue application or reexamination proceeding, the paragraphs of the specification, other than in the claims or abstract, may be numbered at the time the application is filed, and should be individually and consecutively numbered using Arabic numerals, so as to unambiguously identify each paragraph. The number should consist **of at least four numerals** enclosed in square brackets, including leading zeros **(e.g., [0001]).** The numbers and enclosing brackets should appear to the right of the left margin as the first item in each paragraph, before the first word of the paragraph, and should be highlighted in bold.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because all the numbers and enclosing brackets (e.g., 404, 406, 408, and 410) this reference to figures in the abstract is improper. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 16, 17, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "substantially fulfilling" in claims 1, 16, and 23 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially fulfilling " is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claims 1, 16, and 23 are objected because "number of criteria" is not specific, Examiner interprets the phrase as "criteria". The term "substantially fulfilling" is not defined in the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of the ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention is not defining the claim language.

Claims 2 and 17 recite, "distributed manner", which renders the claim indefinite. Proper correction is required.

Claim 2, discloses "*including references between the", the "reference*" is not clearly disclosing the applicant's extent for the word *"reference"*. Examiner suggest that Applicant describe the "reference" as "URI (Uniform Resource Identifier)" which will render claim 13 unnecessary.

Claim 3, discloses "device executing the method", the applicant should refer back specifically to "the method" that he/she is referring to. As for the merits of this office action the Examiner is interpreting claim 3 only as "..the step of executing and internal search in the device".

Claim 10, discloses "associating includes analysis and selection of certain data elements from all found elements", the mention claim is rejected for being broad.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 10 recites the broad recitation "certain data", and the claim also recites "found elements" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 22, discloses "substantially" which render the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined in the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of the ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention is not defining the claim language.

Proper correction is required.

7. The term "most preferable means" in claim 20 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "most preferable means" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependency form. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 22 is not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 14, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 14 and 15 fail to fall within a statutory category of invention. It is directed to the program itself, not a process occurring as a result of executing the program, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the program nor a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the program in a manner which enables the program to act as a computer component and realize its functionality. It's also clearly not directed to a composition of matter. Therefore, it's non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim 23 recites "a device comprising: means for…" the means disclosed in Par [0017] of the specification do not specifically disclose the proper hardware or memory to perform the device functionality recited on the mentioned claim.

For the reason above, claims 14, 15, and 23 are believed to be non-statutory subject matter. It is suggested that Claims 14, 15, and 23 be amended or recite a computer-implemented method at least some of the steps to be performed by a computer and to recite a method claim that produces a concrete and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18, 20, and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yared et al (US Publication No. 2003/0149781),** hereinafter Yared, in view of **Reed et al. (US 2003/0134648 A1).**

As per Claim 1, Yared discloses:

A method comprising:

-obtaining a number of criteria for finding information related to at least one person or entity,

(Abstract and Claim 28, The method of claim 26 further comprising: determining whether the user profile data request is approved in a user policy; and responsive to the determining, sending user profile data to one of the first system entity and the
second system entity.") and (Par [0009], "…Identity information includes attributes such as the user's name, mailing address, e-mail, telephone number, and credit card number. An identity provider is an **entity** that creates, manages, and stores identity information for a plurality of users….") and (Par [0064], "Service provider 210 then parses the embedded credential 235 from the URI and uses back channel communications to **query user profile data** 240 from identity provider…"), "attributes" being the "criteria" as claimed.

-executing a search in a wireless communications network or a connected network thereof in order to access data substantially fulfilling the criteria,

(Abstract, "A distributed network identity is provided. An identity provider stores a portion of a user's personal information. A service provider **accesses user information** from one or more identity providers. System entities such as identity providers and service providers can be linked to enable information sharing and aggregation…") and
(Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet.** Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)…")

-associating at least part of the data found with a context, and

(Par [0118], "…A user may wish to distribute identity information among identity providers and associate the identity providers with distinct computing devices.").

- establishing a reachability information on the basis of the context.

(Par [0176], "In another embodiment, a user can specify the manner in which a service provider handles user **profile data and preferences**. For example, the user can select whether (1) the information is to be used only once and discarded, (2) the information can be saved an reused, (3) the information can be forwarded to another service provider only once then discarded, or (4) the information can be forwarded to other service providers with restriction. The identity provider provides these features for the user, either for individual attributes or on a group of attributes (e.g., a specific profile). Further, users can customize these data control for each service provider in the identity provider's user directory."), "profile data and preferences" being the "reachability information".

However Yared does not specifically discloses "search"

On the other hand Reed discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [0111], "Alternate embodiments to the invention include the ability for the hierarchy process for query (HPQ) to be programmed by a designated entity, person, or group in such a way as deemed appropriate by that party to ensure a desired search procedure. Additionally the hierarchy of user location method's used by the ULDM 904 could be modified, appended, reprioritized or otherwise changed to use a plurality of location methods as programmed by a person, group or other entity to obtain any desired level of detail regarding the accuracy of the latitude and longitude calculations.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Reed into the method of Yared to take advantage of performing a search. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to process the seeking of a particular file or specific data within a specific database.

As per Claim 2, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- comprising data elements, wherein at least part of the data elements are stored in a distributed manner, said elements including references between them.

(Par [0054], "An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter**…").

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared does not specifically disclose:

- further comprising the step of visualizing the reachability information on a display of a device used for accessing the network.

(Par [0139], "The user browses to a portal that allows the user to aggregate the user's information from across all the user's identity providers and provides the above-described services. The user signs into this portal using a network identity…the portal displays…").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared does not specifically disclose:

- wherein said obtaining is performed by setting the criteria with a device used for accessing the wireless network.

(Par [0047], "Embodiments of the present invention include single sign-on, federated identity, and web services features. One skilled in the art will appreciate that the described features can be configured to collaborate or function independently or in any combination. As an example of collaboration, web services features provide a
communication framework for system entities. An identity provider uses aspects of web services to service requests for XML data structures, such as user profile data. … for example, a calendar service can send a reminder to a user's mobile telephone using
the mobile telephone service provider. In this example, the identity provider, the calendar service, and the mobile telephone service use web services to interact or to exchange data. By using web services, these system entities can collaborate regardless of the similarity or dissimilarity of the computing devices hosting them.").

As per Claim 6, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said criteria are utilized as search terms for a phone book of a device used for accessing the wireless network.

(Par [0043], "Example devices include enterprise servers (e.g., Sun Fire 15K, commercially available from Sun Microsystems, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif.), application servers, workstations, personal computers, network computers, network appliances, personal digital assistants, game

consoles, televisions, set-top boxes, premises automation equipment, point-of-sale terminals, automobiles, and personal communications devices (e.g., cellular handsets)…") and (Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet.** Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider
B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)…") and (Par [0092], "k) Logging into a Network Identity Using Non-PC Devices such as Cell Phones, Video Game Consoles, Set-Top Boxes, and PDAs."), "phonebooks" is a well know feature pertaining to a "cell phone".

As per Claim 7, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein during the search a first set of data found is automatically traversed through and at least one associated reference followed in order to find a second set of data.

(Par [0079], "In this scenario, the user has already "logged in" to a network identity-enabled site and traverses to another site that the user previously visited. In this case, there should be no intervention of the user to re-login and the user should automatically be able to use the site as long as the user did not log out or quit the browser session.").

And (Par [0054], "...A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a query parameter, to send to the destination…").

As per Claim 8, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said reachability information is sorted on the basis of the context data.

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy…").

As per Claim 9, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the connected network is the Internet.

(Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet.** Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)…")

As per Claim 10, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said associating includes analysis and selection of certain data elements from all found elements.

(Par [0118], "…A user may wish to distribute identity information among identity providers and **associate the identity providers with distinct computing devices.**").

And (Par [0176], "In another embodiment, a user can specify the manner in which a service provider handles user **profile data and preferences**. For example, the user can select whether (1) the information is to be used only once and discarded…").

As per Claim 11, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said associating or establishing is executed by utilizing a predefined rule set.

(Par [0174], "7. User Profile Services") and (Par [0175], "**Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as "address" and "phone number" with…").

As per Claim 13, the rejection of Claim 2 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said references are substantially in a URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) form.

(Par [0054], "An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter**…").

As per Claim 14, Yared discloses:

- A computer program product including the program code stored in a readable medium such that when executed by a processor executes the method steps of claim 1.

(Par [0043], "…The program instructions can be distributed on a computer readable medium or storage volume. The computer readable storage volume can be available via a public network, a private network, or the Internet. Program instructions can be in any appropriate form, such as source code, object code, or scripting code.).

As per Claim 15, the rejection of Claim 14 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- A carrier medium carrying the computer executable program of claim 14.

(Par [0043], "…The program instructions can be distributed on a computer readable medium or storage volume. The computer readable storage volume can be available via a public network, a private network, or the Internet. Program instructions can be in any appropriate form, such as source code, object code, or scripting code.).

As per Claim 16, Yared discloses:

An electronic device for addressing reachability information over a wireless communications network providing access to a number of data elements,

said device being operable in said wireless communications network and

(Par [0043], "In an embodiment, a system entity is a process that incorporates a distinct set of functionality. For example, identity provider A 105 incorporates functionality to create and to maintain identity information. The functionality of a system entity can be implemented by program instructions that execute in an **appropriate computing device**…") and (Par [0044], "In

an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet.** Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)…")

- comprising a processor and a memory respectively configured to process and store instructions and data,

- said device arranged to obtain a number of criteria for finding information related to at least one person or entity,

(Abstract and Claim 28, The method of claim 26 further comprising: determining whether the user profile data request is approved in a user policy; and responsive to the determining, sending user profile data to one of the first system entity and the
second system entity.") and (Par [0009], "…Identity information includes attributes such as the user's name, mailing address, e-mail, telephone number, and credit card number. An identity provider is an **entity** that creates, manages, and stores identity information for a plurality of users….") and (Par [0064], "Service provider 210 then parses the embedded credential 235 from the URI and uses back channel communications to **query user profile data** 240 from identity provider…"), "attributes" being the "criteria" as claimed.

- further arranged to execute a search in the wireless communications network or a connected network thereof in order to access data substantially fulfilling the criteria,

(Abstract, "A distributed network identity is provided. An identity provider stores a portion of a user's personal information. A service provider **accesses user information** from one or more

identity providers. System entities such as identity providers and service providers can be linked to enable information sharing and aggregation…") and

(Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet.** Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)…")

- arranged to associated at least part of the data found with a context, and

(Par [0118], "…A user may wish to distribute identity information among identity providers and associate the identity providers with distinct computing devices.").

- and arranged to establish the reachability information on the basis of the context.

(Par [0176], "In another embodiment, a user can specify the manner in which a service provider handles user **profile data and preferences**. For example, the user can select whether (1) the information is to be used only once and discarded, (2) the information can be saved an reused, (3) the information can be forwarded to another service provider only once then discarded, or (4) the information can be forwarded to other service providers with restriction. The identity provider provides these features for the user, either for individual attributes or on a group of attributes (e.g., a specific profile). Further, users can customize these data control for each service provider in the identity provider's user directory."), "profile data and preferences" being the "reachability information".

However Yared does not specifically discloses:

- comprising a processor and a memory respectively configured to process and store instructions and data

On the other hand Reed discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [0155], "Sufficient processor/memory and computing ability to run the query software")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Reed into the method of Yared to take advantage of using a processor and memory to perform the instructions. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to manipulate the data in the device and process it to obtain the preferred results.

As per Claim 17, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein at least part of the data elements are stored in a distributed manner, said elements including references between them.

(Par [0054], "An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter**…").

As per Claim 18, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises at least one of the following: a Web browser, a search engine, and parser in order to execute said search or perform said associating.

(Par [0016], "…Each user communicates with the Internet 22 via a Web browser 32 or 42.") and (Abstract, "... In the illustrative embodiment, the attribute relates to internal or external nature of the search engine from which the search request originates…").

As per Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises a set of policies to select the most preferable means of communication based on the context.

(Par [0174], "7. User Profile Services") and (Par [0175], "**Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as "address" and "phone number" with…").

As per Claim 23, being the device claim corresponding to the method of claim 1 respectively and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejections of Claim 1, and further Yared discloses: (Par [0043], "…Example devices include enterprise servers (e.g., Sun Fire 15K, commercially available from Sun Microsystems, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif.), application servers, workstations, personal computers, network computers, network appliances, personal digital assistants, game consoles, televisions, set-top boxes, premises automation equipment, point-of-sale terminals, automobiles, and personal communications devices (e.g., cellular handsets)…").

13. Claims 3, 12, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yared et al (US 2003/0149781),** in view of **Reed et al. (US 2003/0134648 A1) and Parry et al. (US 2003/0061204 A1).**

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further neither Yared nor Reed specifically disclose:

- further comprising the step of executing an internal search in a device *executing the method*

On the other hand Parry discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Abstract, "Source selective information retrieval systems and methods… the attribute relates to **internal or external nature of the search** engine from which the search request originates. The system then retrieves information from a database in response to the request and the attribute. The information retrieval system is disposed at least in part in a computing system and the first source is an external search engine connected **to the computing system via a network**. The system is adapted to receive an information retrieval request from a second source, an internal search engine disposed within the computing system. The inventive system would typically be implemented in a computing system such as a Web server connected to the Internet via a network interface. In this context, the internal search engine would be implemented in software on the computing system side of the network interface and the external search engine would be implemented in software on the network side of the network interface.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use an internal search. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to search into the device's internal database to search locally and save time.

As per Claim 12, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein rules for associating or establishing are received from an external entity.

(Par [0174], "7. User Profile Services") and (Par [0175], "**Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as "address" and "phone number" with…").

However neither Yared nor Reed specifically disclose: "external source".

On the other hand Parry discloses the above claimed features as follow:

(Abstract and Claim 1., "A selective information retrieval system disposed at least in part in a computing system and comprising: first means for receiving an information retrieval request from a first source, said first source being an external search engine connected to said computing system via a network…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to

use an external entity. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to use different components in order to perform a enhanced search to obtain accurate results.

As per Claim 19, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises a configurable rule set for a parser that analyses and creates the context from the returned search results.

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy…").

However neither Yared nor Parry disclose the following:

"parser"

On the other hand Reed discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [1034] The next elements listed in the database log are the elements that will be tracked. These elements will be listed under categories in the log to allow rapid parsing of the log by software after it has been created and stored to a user's local directory of sectionalized portion of a home database structure. The categories are:…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to

use a parser to analyze search results. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to break the data into smaller chunks so that an application can act on the information and save time to the user.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- ***wherein the device is arranged to receive rules for a parser from an external entity.***

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy…").

However neither Yared nor Parry specifically discloses:

"parser from an external entity"

On the other hand Reed disclosed the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [1209]-[1228], "The next software component utilized by the DAN 8100 is the data interface software 8130. The data interface software 8130 receives input data in a usable format. The data interface software 8130 simply parses the supplied data and passes it to the DAN's 8100 primary logic software 8101…") and (Par [1229], "The external DAN query interface software 8135 takes these external sources and formats the data stream that both the data interface software 8130 and the voice mapping software 8110 use to retrieve information from external sources.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use a parser to analyze search results. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to break the data into smaller chunks so that an application can act on the information and save time to the user.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANGELICA RUIZ whose telephone number is (571)570-3158. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ali can be reached on (571) 272-4105. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR

March 17, 2008
/J. M. C./

/Mohammad Ali/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169